

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-8 and 10 are pending in the present application. Claim 9 is herein cancelled. Claims 1-5 are withdrawn from consideration. Claim 6 is herein amended. No new matter has been entered.

**Rejections under 35 USC §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph**

**Claim 6 was rejected under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph.**

The examiner noted that claim 6 fails to clarify what standard is being used for comparison and the specification continues to lack criteria by which one may determine which mesh sizes are included and which are excluded.

Claim 6 has been amended to recite, among other things, "wherein said screen has a mesh size of mesh number of 45 to 75 which corresponds to 1/4 to 1/3 of mesh number specified for ordinary screen printing of said ink."

The amendment is supported in the original specification, for example at page 7, lines 13-18, and at page 16, last 2 lines to page 17, line 2. The first portion in the specification describes as follows:

In the foregoing method of manufacturing a reinforcing fiber sheet, it is preferable to set the screen used for screen printing to a mesh size having a coarseness which is not more than 1/3 and not less than 1/4 of the standard mesh size (this is, the screen mesh size set by the ink manufacturer for each ink to obtain the best printing results).

(At page 7, lines 13-18). The second portion describes as follows:

For example, a mesh size of about 180 to 225 is regarded as appropriate in the case of the above-mentioned Sericol SP2100AU Clear, and a mesh size of about 230 is regarded as appropriate in the case of Sericol EG Screen Ink.

(Page 16, last 2 lines to page 17, line 2). From these description, it is logically clear that the specification discloses the mesh number in the range of  $180/4=45$  to  $225/3=75$ .

Also, because each ink specifies the mesh number for ordinary screen printing of said ink, a person of ordinary skill in the art would easily determine which mesh sizes are included and which are excluded in the present invention.

Thus, the rejection has been overcome.

**Rejections under 35 USC §103(a)**

**Claims 6-10 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Saint Victor (US Patent No. 6,211,308 B1) in view of Tugwell (U.S. Patent No. 4,037,008 A).**

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Responding to Applicants' previous response, the Examiner commented as follows:

Applicant has not addressed the specific argument of the Examiner: that mesh size is a result-effective variable. Further, Applicant has presented no evidence demonstrating the criticality of the claimed mesh size. Consequently, the Examiner's position remains unchanged.

(Office Action, item 6).

As already mentioned, claim 6 has been amended to recite, among other things, “wherein said screen has a mesh size of mesh number of 45 to 75 which corresponds to 1/4 to 1/3 of mesh number specified for ordinary screen printing of said ink.”

Admitting that Saint Victor does not teach the use of a screen having a mesh size coarser than a standard mesh size, the Examiner alleged that Tugwell teaches that the mesh size is a result-effective variable and may be adjusted depending upon the viscosity of the ink utilized as well as the thickness and degree of detail desired. However, each ink specifies mesh size for ordinary screen printing. Therefore, even assuming, *arguendo*, that mesh size is a result-effective variable, nothing indicates that the screen has a mesh size of 1/4 to 1/3 of mesh number specified for ordinary screen printing of said ink. Tugwell is discussing the ordinary standard screen printing, and nothing indicates that the screen has a mesh size much coarser than a standard mesh size specified for ordinary screen printing of the ink.

Thus, Saint Victor and Tugwell does not teach or suggest “wherein said screen has a mesh size of mesh number of 45 to 75 which corresponds to 1/4 to 1/3 of mesh number specified for ordinary screen printing of said ink.”

For at least these reasons, claim 6 patentably distinguishes over Saint Victor and Tugwell. Claim 7, 8, and 10, depending from claim 6 also patentably distinguishes over Saint Victor and Tugwell for at least the same reasons. Claim 9 has been cancelled.

Thus, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Application No.: 10/541,898  
Art Unit: 1792

Submission under 37 C.F.R. §1.114  
Attorney Docket No.: 052788

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sadao Kinashi", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Sadao Kinashi  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 48,075  
Telephone: (202) 822-1100  
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

SK/kn